





Response under 37 C.F.R. 1.116 -

Expedited Procedure Examining Group (2161)

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: Edenson et al. Serial No.: 09/170,864

Filed: 10/13/1998

For:

January 28, 2002

SECURE DISTRIBUTION OF DIGITAL DATA

RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. 1.116

Examiner: Elisca, Pierre E. Docket No. TI-25667 RECEIVED

FEB 2 7 2002

Assistant Commissioner for Patents

Washington, DC 202 RECEIVED

FEB 2 6 2002

Technology Center 2600

MAILING CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 GONDOLOGY CENTER 2100 I hereby certify that the above correspondence is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231 on the date shown below.

Art Unit: 2161

Dear Sir:

In response to the Examiner's Action mailed November 26, 2001, applicant responds as follows:

REMARKS

This application was originally filed on October 13, 1998 with forty-two claims, five of which were written in independent form. No claims have been allowed.

Claim 25 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e), or according to the Office Action mailed November 26, 2001 under §102(a), as being anticipated by Houvener. The applicant respectfully disagrees. MPEP § 2131 provides:

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described in a single prior art reference." Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. Of California, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053, (Fed. Cir. 1987). "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as contained in the. .. claim." Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co., 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). The elements must be arranged as required by the claim In re Bond, 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

The Examiner, citing column 4, lines 1-12 and column 6, lines 54-67 of Houvener, states, "the point of identification terminal (or identification system module) and [sic] searches the